

INDUCTION MEASUREMENTS WITH REDUCED BOREHOLE EFFECTS

DESCRIPTION

- [Para 1] Cross-reference to related applications
- [Para 2] This claims benefit, under 35 U.S.C. § 119, of Provisional Application Serial No. 60/511,467 filed October 15, 2003. This Provisional Application is incorporated by reference in its entirety.
- [Para 3] Statement regarding federally sponsored research or development
- [Para 4] Not applicable.
- [Para 5] Background of Invention
- [Para 6] Field of the Invention
- [Para 7] The invention relates generally to techniques for formation resistivity logging using induction tools. More particularly, the invention relates to induction tools and methods for reducing borehole effects in resistivity measurements.
- [Para 8] Background Art
- [Para 9] Electromagnetic (EM) induction tools are used in the oil and gas industry to determine the resistivity of earth formations surrounding a borehole. Induction tools work by using a transmitting coil (transmitter) to set up an alternating magnetic field in the earth formations. This alternating magnetic field induces eddy currents in the formations. One or more receiving coils (receivers), disposed at a distance from the transmitter, are used to detect the current flowing in the earth formation. The magnitudes of the received signals are approximately proportional to the formation conductivity. Therefore, formation conductivities may be derived from the received signals.
- [Para 10] Conventional wireline and LWD EM induction tools are implemented with coils (antennas) that may function as sources and/or sensors. On wireline EM induction tools, the antennas are typically enclosed by a housing (or tool

body) constructed of a tough plastic (insulating) material, e.g., a laminated fiberglass material impregnated with epoxy resin. On LWD EM induction tools, the antennas are generally mounted on metallic supports (collars) to withstand the harsh environments encountered during drilling.

[Para 11] On both wireline and LWD induction tools, the antennas are typically spaced apart from each other along the axis of the tool. These antennas are generally coils of the solenoid type that comprise one or more turns of insulated conductor wire wound around a support. U.S. Patent Nos. 4,873,488 and 5,235,285 (both assigned to the present assignee), for example, disclose instruments equipped with antennas disposed along a central metallic support (a conductive mandrel).

[Para 12] A coil (or antenna) carrying a current can be represented as a magnetic moment proportional to the current and the area. The direction and magnitude of the magnetic moment can be represented by a vector perpendicular to the plane of the coil. In conventional induction and propagation logging instruments, the transmitter and receiver antennas are mounted with their magnetic moments aligned with the longitudinal axis of the instruments. That is, these instruments have longitudinal magnetic dipoles (LMD). When an LMD tool is placed in a borehole and energized to transmit EM energy, the induced eddy currents flow in loops around the antenna in the borehole and in the surrounding formation. These eddy currents flow in planes that are perpendicular to the tool axis (hence, borehole axis). Therefore, no eddy current flows up or down the borehole when the tool is centralized in the borehole.

[Para 13] An emerging technique in the field of EM induction well logging is the use of instruments incorporating antennas having tilted or transverse antennas, i.e., the magnetic dipoles of the antennas are tilted or perpendicular to the tool axis. That is, these instruments have transverse or tilted magnetic dipoles (TMD). These TMD instruments can induce eddy currents that flow up and down the borehole and, thus, provide measurements that are sensitive to dipping planes, formation fractures, or formation anisotropy. Modern induction tools typically include triaxial arrays, in which the transmitter and

receivers may each comprise three coils arranged in different orientations (typically in orthogonal directions). Two of the coils in a triaxial transmitter or receiver may be TMD antennas. Logging instruments equipped with TMDs are described, for example, in U.S. Patent Nos. 4,319,191, 5,508,616, 5,757,191, 5,781,436, 6,044,325, and 6,147,496.

[Para 14] While the TMD tools (including triaxial tools) are capable of providing additional information about the formation resistivity, these tools are more strongly affected by the borehole, particularly in high contrast situations, i.e., when the mud in the borehole is more conductive than the formation. When a TMD tool is energized at the center of a borehole (shown as 20 in FIG. 1a), it can induce eddy currents flowing up and down the borehole. However, due to the symmetry, the up and down currents cancel out and there is no net current flowing up or down the borehole. When a TMD tool is eccentric, the symmetry may disappear. If the TMD tool is eccentric in a direction parallel to the direction of the magnetic dipole of its antenna (shown as 22 in FIG. 1a), the symmetry with respect to the antenna is maintained and there is still no net current flowing along the borehole axis, when the antenna is energized. However, if a TMD is eccentric in a direction perpendicular to the direction of the magnetic dipole of its antenna (shown as 21 in FIG. 1a), the symmetry no longer exists and there will be net currents flowing up or down the borehole, when the antenna is energized. In high contrast situations (i.e., conductive mud and resistive formation), the borehole currents can flow a long distance along the borehole. The current flow in the formation will also be asymmetric in this case. These asymmetric currents induce undesired signals in the TMD receivers that can be many times larger than the expected signals from the formation.

[Para 15] U.S. Patent No. 5,041,975 (assigned to the present assignee) discloses a technique for processing data from downhole measurements to correct for borehole effects. U.S. Patent No. 5,058,077 discloses a technique for processing downhole sensor data to compensate for the effect of eccentric rotation on the sensor while drilling. U.S. Patent No. 6,541,979 (assigned to

the present assignee) discloses techniques for reducing the effect of borehole eccentricity, using mathematical corrections for the borehole currents effects.

[Para 16] U.S. Patent No. 6,573,722 (assigned to the present assignee) discloses methods to reduce the effect of tool eccentricity in the borehole by minimizing the borehole currents passing the TMD antennas. This patent is hereby incorporated by reference. In one embodiment, an electrode located below the TMD antenna is hard-wired to another electrode located above the TMD antenna to provide a conductive path behind the TMD antenna. This additional conductive path reduces the amount of borehole currents passing in front of the TMD antenna, and thus minimizes the undesirable effects. In another embodiment, a tool is disclosed that generates a localized current in the borehole (between the two electrodes located on either side of a TMD antenna) that counteracts or cancels out the undesirable borehole currents. Further examples of methods and apparatus for reducing the borehole current effects include U.S. Patent Nos. 6,573,722 B2, 6,624,634 B2, 6,693,430 B2, 6,680,613 B2, 6,710,601 B2, all of which are issued to Rosthal et al. and assigned to the assignee of the present invention, and published U.S. Patent Applications Serial Nos. 2003/0146753 A1 and 2003/0155924 A1, both of which are by Rosthal et al. and assigned to the assignee of the present invention.

[Para 17] While these prior art methods are effective in reducing borehole effects on induction tools, there remains a need for further improvements in the design of induction tools that are less affected by tool eccentricity in the borehole. Experimental studies showed that the strategy of canceling current flow up and down the borehole did not give satisfactory performance. Large electrodes can produce a temperature-dependent error signal, so it is preferable to use small electrodes.

[Para 18] Summary of Invention

[Para 19] One aspect of the invention relates to induction tools. An induction tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention includes a conductive mandrel; at least one array comprising a transmitter, a bucking coil, and a receiver disposed in an insulating tool body surrounding the

conductive mandrel; and an electrode disposed in the insulating tool body at a selected location between the bucking coil and the receiver, wherein the selected location is spaced from the transmitter at a distance corresponding approximately to a harmonic mean of a distance between the transmitter and the bucking coil and a distance between the transmitter and the receiver, and wherein the electrode includes a contact connecting it to the conductive mandrel.

[Para 20] Another aspect of the invention relates to methods for designing induction tools. A method in accordance with one embodiment of the invention includes disposing at least one array comprising a transmitter, a bucking coil, and a receiver on an insulating tool body surrounding a conductive mandrel of the induction tool; determining a location of null sensitivity, wherein the location of null sensitivity is located at a harmonic mean of a distance between the transmitter and the bucking coil and a distance between the transmitter and the receiver; and disposing a small electrode on the insulating tool body proximate the location of null sensitivity, wherein a conductive path is formed between the electrode and the conductive mandrel.

[Para 21] Other aspects and advantages of the invention will be apparent from the following description and the appended claims.

[Para 22] Brief Description of Drawings

[Para 23] FIGs. 1a and 1b, respectively, illustrate tool eccentering of a transverse array and the asymmetric current distribution that causes the undesired borehole effects.

[Para 24] FIG. 2 shows a schematic of a triaxial array.

[Para 25] FIG. 3 shows the effects of eccentering on various transverse XX arrays on an insulating-body induction tool.

[Para 26] FIG. 4 shows the effects of eccentering on various transverse XX arrays on a conductive-body induction tool.

[Para 27] FIG. 5 shows an induction tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention.

[Para 28] FIG. 6 shows results from simulations of tools as shown in FIG. 5 having different numbers of electrodes disposed on the tool body.

[Para 29] FIG. 7 shows an induction tool having small electrodes in accordance with one embodiment of the invention.

[Para 30] FIG. 8A shows enlarged view of electrodes in accordance with one embodiment of the invention.

[Para 31] FIG. 8B shows a sectional view of a fingered electrode that may be used with embodiment of the invention.

[Para 32] FIGs. 8C and 8D show other embodiments of a fingered electrode that may be used with embodiments of the invention.

[Para 33] FIG. 9 shows simulated measurements using a tool shown in FIG. 7 in accordance with one embodiment of the invention.

[Para 34] FIG. 10 shows the effects of eccentering on a tool shown in FIG. 7 as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 35] FIG. 11 shows the ability of a tool shown in FIG. 7 to measure formation anisotropy, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 36] FIG. 12 shows the ability of a tool shown in FIG. 7 to measure formation anisotropy in the presence of tool eccentering, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 37] FIG. 13 shows the shoulder-bed effects on a tool shown in FIG. 7, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 38] FIG. 14 shows the effects of eccentering and shoulder bed on a tool as shown in FIG. 7, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 39] FIG. 15 shows the results of FIG. 14 after removal of shoulder-bed effects of a tool shown in FIG. 7, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 40] FIG. 16 shows one prototype tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention.

[Para 41] FIG. 17 shows 27" triaxial conductivity measurements in the presence of tool eccentering using a tool shown in FIG. 16, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 42] FIG. 18 shows 39" triaxial conductivity measurements in the presence of tool eccentering using a tool shown in FIG. 16, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 43] FIG. 19 shows a computer model of a prototype tool in accordance with another embodiment of the invention.

[Para 44] FIG. 20 shows 27" triaxial conductivity measurements in the presence of tool eccentering using a tool shown in FIG. 19, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 45] FIG. 21 shows a computer model of a prototype tool in accordance with another embodiment of the invention.

[Para 46] FIG. 22 shows 27" triaxial conductivity measurements in the presence of tool eccentering using a tool shown in FIG. 21, as compared with an insulating-body tool and a metal-body tool.

[Para 47] FIG. 23 shows a method for designing a tool that is less impacted by tool eccentering.

[Para 48] Detailed Description

[Para 49] Embodiments of the invention relate to induction logging tools that are less affected by borehole effects. Because the distinction between an induction tool and a propagation tool is not germane to this invention, the term "induction tool" is used in this description to include both the induction and propagation tools. Similarly, borehole effects and tool eccentering effects (or eccentricity effects) are used interchangeably in this description because the distinction between them is not germane. One of ordinary skill would appreciate that conductivity is an inverse of the resistivity, and, therefore, any reference to "conductivity" in this description is intended to include its inverse, the "resistivity," and vice versa.

[Para 50] As noted above, induction arrays with magnetic moments perpendicular (i.e., transverse) to the axis of the borehole are more sensitive to the borehole effects. In addition, the sensitivity of a transverse coil to eccentricity is very different depending on whether the eccentricity is in the direction of the magnetic moment or perpendicular to the magnetic moment. In this description, a transverse array is used in a broad sense to include any array having a transverse component in its magnetic moment. For example, an array having a tilted coil (i.e., a coil not parallel or perpendicular to the axis of the tool) will have a transverse component in its magnetic moment and, therefore, may be referred to as a transverse array in this description. Note that a triaxial array includes two transverse arrays and, therefore, the following description about a transverse array is also applicable to the “transverse components” in a triaxial array.

[Para 51] FIG. 1a illustrates that a logging tool may have its transverse or tilted magnetic dipole (TMD) antenna located at the center (shown as 20) of the borehole 13 or eccentered in a parallel direction (shown as 22) or a perpendicular direction (shown as 21). The parallel or perpendicular direction is with respect to the direction of the magnetic dipole of the antenna. Parallel eccentering 22 produces eddy currents up and down the borehole. However, due to the symmetry, no net current flows up or down the borehole. Thus, a tool having its TMD antenna eccentered in the parallel direction 22 does not produce undesired effects more than a tool having its TMD antenna perfectly at the center of the borehole 20 does. In contrast, a tool having its TMD antenna eccentered in the perpendicular direction 21 induces eddy currents to flow up and down the borehole, but without the symmetry to cancel out the up and down currents. As a result, perpendicular eccentering 21 gives rise to significant borehole currents 23, as shown in FIG. 1b. The current flow in the formation is also asymmetric in this case. The asymmetric current distribution produces a strong signal in a receiver 24 disposed on the resistivity instrument 10.

[Para 52] The perpendicular eccentering 21 and parallel eccentering 22 shown in FIG. 1a illustrate the extremes of tool displacements from the center of the

borehole 20. In a typical case, the eccentering would likely lie between these two extremes, i.e., eccentering in a direction that is a combination of both the x and y directions.

[Para 53] A typical induction tool, such as the AIT™ tool from Schlumberger Technology Corp. (Houston, TX), includes several induction arrays comprising a common transmitter and several receivers spaced apart from the transmitter. Induction tools may also include electrodes in addition to coils, as described for example in U.S. Patent Nos. 6,573,722, 6,680,613, and 6,710,601 issued to Rosthal et al. Examples of such induction tools are described in U.S. Patent Nos. 4,873,488 issued to Barber et al. and 5,041,975 issued to Minerbo et al. In a typical induction tool, each main receiver in the array may be connected in series with a bucking coil. The function of a bucking coil is to cancel the direct coupling between the transmitter and the receiver.

[Para 54] When the bucking coil is optimized, the receiver should produce no signal in a medium with zero conductivity (e.g., air); this condition is referred to as mutual balance. One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the number of turns of the bucking coil and the spacing between the transmitter and the bucking coil may be properly selected to provide an optimal cancellation of the direct coupling between the transmitter and the main receiver.

[Para 55] Referring to FIG. 2, the mutual balance condition can be expressed approximately as

$$M_z^B = - \left(\frac{Z_B}{Z_R} \right)^3 M_z^R. \quad (1)$$

where

$$M_z^B, M_z^R$$

are the magnetic moments in the z -direction for the bucking and the main receiver coils, respectively, and Z_B, Z_R are the distances (spacings) from the transmitter for the bucking and the receiver coils, respectively. For a triaxial array, the same condition applies to the x and y couplings.

Modern induction tools often include one or more triaxial arrays, in which the transmitter, the main receiver, and the bucking coil each may include three coils (antennas) in different orientations (typically, in orthogonal directions).

FIG. 2 illustrates a schematic of a typical triaxial array, which includes a transmitter (T), a main receiver (R), and a bucking coil (B). As shown, each of the transmitter, main receiver, and bucking coil has three separate coils, which have magnetic moments in orthogonal directions. The three magnetic moments of the transmitter (T) are shown as

$$M_z^T, M_y^T, M_x^T.$$

The three magnetic moments of the main receiver are shown as

$$M_z^R, M_y^R, M_x^R.$$

The three magnetic moments of the bucking coils are shown as

M_x^S , M_y^S , M_z^S .

[Para 56] Because the transmitter and the receiver in a triaxial array each include three antennas (see FIG. 2), nine complex voltages would be recorded using a triaxial array, giving a matrix of apparent conductivities as follows:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{xx} & \sigma_{xy} & \sigma_{xz} \\ \sigma_{yx} & \sigma_{yy} & \sigma_{yz} \\ \sigma_{zx} & \sigma_{zy} & \sigma_{zz} \end{bmatrix}.$$

[Para 57] Because these nine couplings are obtained with antennas in different directions, they will be affected by tool eccentering or borehole effects to different extents. FIG. 3 illustrates simulated voltage measurements for various couplings of triaxial arrays in a tool with an insulating body (not shown). The spacings between the transmitter and the main receiver coils are 27, 39, 54, and 72 inches. The frequency of operation is 26.8 kHz for all calculations and measurements in this description.

[Para 58] In FIG. 3, the computed R signals of XX couplings from various arrays are plotted against the tool displacement (eccentering) along the y axis in the borehole. The borehole has a diameter of 8.5 inches and is filled with a mud having a conductivity of 5000 mS/m. It is apparent from FIG. 3 that the errors in the XX signals are large, as compared to the formation conductivity, 50 mS/m. In a conductive mud, for displacement (eccentering) along the y axis, the errors in the XX couplings are much larger than the errors in the YY couplings. See U.S. Patent Nos. 6,573,722 issued to Rosthal et al. and 6,556,015 issued to Omeragic et al.

[Para 59] The borehole effects as seen in FIG. 3 can be minimized if a conductive tool body (e.g., metal body) is used. FIG. 4 shows the eccentricity effect of a metal-body tool (not shown) in a conductive borehole. The R signals of the XX couplings for the four transmitter-receiver spacings are plotted against the tool displacement (eccentering) along the y direction in the borehole. For the longer spacings 39", 54" and 72", the XX couplings are almost independent of tool eccentricity. However, the shorter spacing array 27XX is still significantly affected by tool eccentering.

[Para 60] While a metal body can provide effective reduction in borehole effects, the metal body gives rise to temperature-dependent errors in the measurements. An alternative to metal body tool design is disclosed in a co-pending Applications Serial No. 10/604,622 filed on August 5, 2003 by Barer et al. and Patent No. 6,667,620 granted December 23, 2003 by Homan et al. The induction tools disclosed in these applications have insulating housings (tool body) for the receiver coils. The insulating body includes conducting electrodes (ring electrodes or fingered electrodes) disposed between the transmitter and receiver coils; the conductive electrodes are electrically grounded to the metallic central support mandrel. These electrodes prevent the asymmetric flow of current in the borehole, reducing the error contributions of tool eccentering to the XX , and YY couplings. With these designs, the eccentricity effect is substantially reduced compared with the insulating-body tool. However these designs give insufficient cancellation of the eccentricity effects in larger boreholes. In addition, this type of electrode complicates the response of short-spacing measurements even when the tool is centralized in the borehole.

[Para 61] Embodiments of the invention improve the design of an induction tool by using a number of electrodes disposed between the transmitter and the receivers. To understand the contribution of a plurality of electrodes in an insulating tool body, a hypothetical tool with an increasing number of electrodes is modeled (FIG. 5).

[Para 62] The induction tool shown in FIG. 5 includes a conductive mandrel M, a tool body B, and several arrays. The arrays include a common transmitter T

and a series of main receivers at 27", 39" 54", and 72" spacings, designated as R27, R39, R54, and R72, respectively. In addition, corresponding bucking coils, B27, B39, B54, and B72 are included to reduce mutual couplings between the transmitter and the main receivers. Several electrodes (electrode 1–6) designed to reduce borehole effects are also shown on the tool. The following simulations are performed with various electrodes (electrode 1–6) included to study the contribution of these electrodes to borehole effect reduction. In the first calculation, only electrode 1 is present. In the second calculation, only electrodes 1 and 2 are present, and so forth.

[Para 63] FIG. 6 shows the transverse eccentricity effect for four receiver spacings with an increasing number of electrodes (curves 1–6 correspond to the numbers of electrodes in each panel). As shown in FIG. 6, the 27XX coupling needs to have the first three electrodes (electrodes 1–3 in FIG. 5) to have stable measurements regardless of tool eccentering. The 39XX coupling needs to have at least four electrodes (electrodes 1–4 in FIG. 5) to have stable measurements. The 54XX coupling needs to have five electrodes (electrodes 1–4 in FIG. 5) to have stable measurements. For the 72XX coupling, all six electrodes are needed to obtain a good cancellation of the eccentricity effect. These results suggest that an electrode is needed above and below every receiver coil. The electrode (i.e., electrode 6) beyond the last receiver (R72) is preferably placed at a location such that this electrode (i.e., electrode 6) and the one (electrode 5) before the last receiver (R72) are situated symmetrically with respect to the receiver (R72). That is, in preferred embodiments, electrode 5 and electrode 6 symmetrically “straddle” or “bestride” receiver R72.

[Para 64] In addition, it was found that additional electrodes may be included above and below the transmitter T to improve the borehole effect cancellation. In preferred embodiments, the electrodes above and below the transmitter are symmetrically positioned around the transmitter to provide good borehole effect cancellation. In some embodiments, there are two electrodes each above and below the transmitter to improve the borehole effect cancellation (see e.g., T1–T4 in FIG. 7). In some embodiments, the electrodes above and below the transmitter have longer axial (longitudinal) span than other

electrodes. In some embodiments, the electrodes above and below the transmitter are placed close to the transmitter.

[Para 65] Multi-electrode tool design

[Para 66] The above simulation reveals where the electrodes should be placed, i.e., one each at above and below each receiver. However, large electrodes on an induction array may contribute unacceptable errors on the measured voltages (on both in-phase and quadrature components). These errors may not be easily corrected because these errors depend on temperature, and mechanical motion of the electrodes relative to the coils. Therefore, a study was performed to see whether the borehole effect can be cancelled using small electrodes strategically placed on the induction sonde. The sensitivity of the measurements due to a small inhomogeneity near the sonde body can be predicted approximately by Doll's geometrical factor. See J.H. Moran and K.S. Kunz, "*Basic Theory of Induction Logging and Application to the Study of Two-Coil Sondes*," Geophysics, Vol. 6, pp. 829–58, December 1962; and H.G. Doll, "*Introduction to Induction Logging and Application to Logging of Wells Drilled with Oil Base Mud*," J. Petroleum Technology, Vol. 1, No. 6, pp. 148–62, June 1949. A small inhomogeneity at vertical position z

produces a voltage change

(ΔV_{xx})

in the coaxial receiver voltage

V_{xx}

proportional to

$$\Delta V_{xx} \propto \frac{M_t^R}{z^3} \left(\frac{M_t^R}{|z - z_R|^3} + \frac{M_t^S}{|z - z_S|^3} \right) \quad (2)$$

All the terms in Equation (2) have the similar meanings as those described above with reference to FIG. 2. This function has a zero at a position

z_0

obtained by solving

$$\frac{M_t^R}{|z_0 - z_R|^3} = - \frac{M_t^S}{|z_0 - z_S|^3} \quad (3)$$

[Para 67] Because of the mutual balance condition in equation (1), we can write

$$\frac{z_R^3}{|z_0 - z_R|^3} = \frac{z_B^3}{|z_0 - z_B|^3}, \quad (4)$$

[Para 68] or, equivalently,

$$1 - z_0/z_R = z_0/z_B - 1, \quad (5)$$

[Para 69] which gives

$$z_0 = \frac{2}{\frac{1}{z_B} + \frac{1}{z_R}}. \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) shows that the position of null sensitivity,

z_0 ,

is at the harmonic mean of

z_B

and

z_R .

In other words, the distance of the location of null sensitivity from the transmitter is a harmonic mean of the distances from the transmitter to the bucking coil and to the main receiver. The XX and YY couplings also have null sensitivity near this position. Note that Equation (6) gives an exact null sensitivity location for point dipole antennas in air. However, it will only give an approximate location for an actual tool.

[Para 70] FIG. 7 shows an induction tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. The induction tool 70 includes a small electrode near the position of null sensitivity for each receiver. The term “small electrode” means the electrode has a small (e.g., 1") axial (longitudinal) span (*cf.* FIG. 5 and FIG. 7). These small electrodes constitute a smaller portion of the tool body

(lengthwise) and, therefore, will introduce less temperature-dependent errors into the induction measurements. In this description, an induction tool having a plurality of small electrodes including electrodes disposed at the null sensitivity locations is referred to as a “multi-electrode” induction tool. This term is used to differentiate it from a prior art metal-body induction tool or an insulating-body induction tool.

[Para 71] As shown in FIG. 7, a small electrode E7 is also placed below the farthest receiver R72, and four small electrodes T1 – T4 are placed around the transmitter T. In preferred embodiments, the electrode above E6 and below E7 the farthest receiver R72 are substantially equally spaced from the receiver R72. Likewise, the electrodes above (T1, T2) and below (T3, T4) the transmitter T are substantially equally spaced from the transmitter. Note that while four electrodes (T1–T4) are shown, other numbers of electrodes may also be included around the transmitter T. Further, each of the electrode may be a continuous ring electrode, a segmented ring electrode, a continuous finger electrode, a segmented finger electrode, or a plurality of button electrodes arranged around the circumference of the tool body and interspersed with an insulating material.

[Para 72] FIG. 8A shows two small (short axial span) electrodes 80 for use on an induction tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. As shown, the electrode 80 comprises a plurality of (eight) segmented electrodes (or button electrodes) 81 interspersed with eight sections of an insulation material 82 to form a ring that is disposed at the null sensitivity location shown in FIG. 7. Note that while this example shows eight button electrodes, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that other numbers of button electrode/insulating material sections may also be used. Therefore, the particular number of button electrodes and the shapes and sizes of the button electrodes shown are not intended to limit the invention.

[Para 73] The electrode 80 shown in FIG. 8A will conduct currents from the borehole into the conductive mandrel (not shown), via contacts 81, but will not conduct currents in the azimuthal direction. Several variations of such an electrode are possible, including different numbers, shapes, and sizes of

electrodes. As noted above, the electrode may be made of a ring electrode or a segmented ring electrode, i.e., with segmentations in the azimuthal direction and the gaps filled with an insulating material. The segmented ring electrode will not permit currents to flow in the azimuthal direction. This further minimizes interference with the induction measurements. In addition, if it is desirable to have electrodes with a larger longitudinal span (along the axial direction of the tool), the electrode may be preferably made of metallic fingers.

[Para 74] FIG. 8B shows an example of a fingered electrode that may be used with embodiments of the invention. As shown, a cross section of the fingered electrode 80B comprise one or more conductive wires arranged in the shape of fingers 81B interspersed with a plurality of insulating sections 82B. The conductive fingers 81B are connected to the conductive mandrel (not shown) by a plurality of contacts (connectors) 83B.

[Para 75] FIG. 8C shows a variant of a fingered electrode designed to allow current to flow from borehole to mandrel, while minimizing eddy currents in the electrode itself. This particular embodiment may be conveniently manufactured from a conductive sheet 81C by creating a plurality of gaps 82C from the top and the bottom in an alternating pattern. This variant of “fingered” electrode may be wrapped around the tool body without forming a complete circumference (i.e., with at least one gap) so that current cannot flow in the azimuthal (circumferential) direction. In this case only one contact (e.g., 83B in FIG. 8B) is needed to create a conductive path to the inner conductive mandrel.

[Para 76] FIG. 8D shows another example of a fingered electrode. In this example, two sets of conductive wires (fingers) 81D are printed on an insulating material 82D. One set of fingers 81D are connected on the top, while the second set of fingers 81D are connected at the bottom. The first set and the second set of fingers may be interspersed without contacting each other. Again, this embodiment may be wrapped around the tool body, preferably with at least one gap to avoid current flows in the azimuthal direction. This particular configuration of “fingered” electrode is similar to the Faraday shield disclosed in FIG. 4 of U.S. 6,667,620, which is issued to Homan

et al. and assigned to the present assignee. This patent also discloses methods for making such electrodes using print circuit technologies. This patent is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety. One of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate the fingered electrodes shown in FIGs. 8B–8D are for illustration only and other modifications are possible without departing from the scope of the invention. In addition, one of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that the thickness of the conductive sheet/wire that forms the conductive “fingers” and the density of the “fingers” may be varied, depending on particular configurations of the tools, to optimize the reduction of the borehole effects with minimum interference with the EM measurements. Furthermore, while these examples show that the “fingers” are oriented in the longitudinal direction, it is also possible to have the fingers oriented in other direction (e.g., in the transverse direction).

[Para 77] The properties of a tool in accordance with embodiments of the invention, such as the “multi-electrode” tool shown in FIG. 7, are studied with finite-element analysis and compared with prior art tools. FIG. 9 shows results of the finite-element calculations of responses in a homogeneous (isotropic) medium for four measurements 27XX, 39XX, 54XX, and 72XX arrays on three different types of tools: a multi-electrode tool, a metal-body tool, and an insulating-body tool. It is apparent from FIG. 9 that the multi-electrode tool in accordance with embodiments of the invention can produce measurements essentially the same as those of the metal-body or insulating body induction tools.

[Para 78] FIG. 10 shows the eccentricity responses of 27XX, 39XX, 54XX, and 72XX measurements made by the same three different types of induction tools in an 8.5-inch diameter borehole. The formation conductivity is 50 mS/m and the mud conductivity is 5000 mS/m. It is clear from FIG. 10 that the behavior of the multi-electrode induction tool is similar to that of the metal-body tool in most situations. Both the multi-electrode tool and the metal-body tool are more insensitive to tool eccentering than the insulating-body tool.

[Para 79] Transverse arrays are developed because they are sensitive to formation resistivity in the vertical direction. One main use of the transverse

array is in the measurement of resistivity of anisotropic formations. Therefore, it is important that the inclusion of multi-electrodes does not degrade their ability to measure the vertical resistivity in anisotropic formations. FIG. 11 shows the responses of 27XX, 39XX, 54XX, and 72XX measurements in an anisotropic formation with the tool centralized in a conductive 16-inch diameter borehole. The tool is centralized in a 16-inch diameter borehole with a mud conductivity of 5000 mS/m. The formation horizontal conductivity is 500 mS/m. The ratio of vertical resistivity (R_v) to horizontal resistivity (R_h), R_v/R_h , is varied from 1 to 10 in this study. The anisotropy responses of the multi-electrode tool are preserved, and are close to those of a metal-body tool.

[Para 80] FIG. 11 shows that the multi-electrode tool is useful in measuring resistivities in an anisotropic formation when the tool is centered in the borehole. To be useful, the ability of these tools to measure anisotropic resistivity should not be degraded by the tool eccentering. FIG. 12 shows the responses of 27XX, 39XX, 54XX, and 72XX measurements in an anisotropic formation with three types of tools decentralized by 4 inches along the y direction in a conductive 16-inch diameter borehole having a mud conductivity of 5000 mS/m. The formation horizontal conductivity is 500 mS/m. The ratio R_v/R_h is varied from 1 to 10 in this study. The anisotropy responses of the multi-electrode tool are similar to those of the metal-body tool. Both the multi-electrode tool and the metal-body tool are sensitive to a wider range of anisotropy, as compared with the insulating-body tool. The eccentered insulating-body tool could not give a reliable indication of R_v/R_h , as seen by comparing FIGS. 11 and 12.

[Para 81] Effect of borehole on vertical response

[Para 82] In a typical array induction log (e.g., an AIT log), borehole corrections are applied assuming a homogeneous medium outside the borehole. See e.g., U.S. Patent No. 5,041,975 issued to Minerbo et al. An important issue is whether the borehole effect can be separated from the vertical response of the tool (e.g., shoulder bed effects). Shoulder bed effects

occur in thin bed formations, especially when the adjacent beds are more conductive than the bed under investigation. The shoulder bed effects lead to erroneous readings that need to be corrected before an accurate formation resistivity can be derived from the measurements.

[Para 83] FIG. 13 shows responses of the 39XX measurements of three different types of tools in a homogeneous medium (50 mS/m) and in a three-layer formation with no borehole. The three-layer formation comprises a 12-foot bed having a conductivity of 50 mS/m, sandwiched between two layers having a conductivity of 1000 mS/m. The results shown are computed by finite-element calculations. As shown in FIG. 13, while all three types of tools produce accurate conductivity (about 50 mS/m) in the homogeneous formation, the tool readings (about 130 mS/m) are all significantly impacted by the presence of more conductive layers above and below the layer of interest (the 12-foot bed).

[Para 84] The shoulder-bed effects, as shown in FIG. 13, can significantly complicate the measurements, especially in the presence of tool eccentering. FIG. 14 shows the eccentricity responses of 39XX arrays in three different types of induction tools in a borehole with and without the shoulder beds. The homogeneous formation has a conductivity of 50 mS/m. The three-layer formation model (shoulder-bed model) has a 12-foot thin bed (50 mS/m), sandwiched between more conductive beds (1000 mS/m). The 16-inch borehole is filled with a mud having a 5000 mS/m conductivity.

[Para 85] As shown in FIG. 14, the insulating tool (curves 1,2) are significantly affected by eccentering effects, regardless of formation types. Note that shoulder-bed effects add different amount of readings to the measurement depending on the tool eccentering, i.e., the difference between curve 1 and curve 2 becomes more pronounced as the tool eccentering increases. In contrast, the metal-body tool (curves 5,6) and the multi-electrode tool (curves 3,4) are less affected by shoulder-bed effects and the shoulder-bed effects seem constant, irrespective of tool eccentering. Thus, a multi-electrode tool in accordance with embodiments of the invention will produce more reliable

measurements than an insulating-body tool, and the shoulder-bed effects will be easier to correct.

[Para 86] FIG. 15 shows the results from shoulder-bed effect corrections of results shown in FIG. 14. As shown, the eccentricity responses of 39XX measurements for the three different types of induction tools are shown with and without shoulder-bed effect correction. Curve 1 shows the response of the insulating-body tool with shoulder-bed effect correction, while curve 2 shows measurement from the same tool in a homogeneous formation. It is apparent that the shoulder-bed effects cannot be correctly removed across different tool eccentricity, i.e., curve 1 is different from curve 2. In other words, the eccentricity effects and the shoulder-bed effects are not easily separable with an insulating-body tool. In contrast, the curves (curves 3,5) after shoulder-bed correction are super imposable with the corresponding curves for the homogeneous formation measurements (curves 4,6) for the multi-electrode tool and the metal-body tool. This result indicates that the eccentricity effect and shoulder-bed effect are approximately separable for the multi-electrode tool and the metal-body tool, but not for the insulating-body tool.

[Para 87] Experimental verification

[Para 88] The above simulations show that a multi-electrode induction tool in accordance with embodiments of the invention produce similar measurements as those of a metal-body tool. The measurements of a multi-electrode tool are less influenced by tool eccentricity (borehole effects) or shoulder-bed effects, as compared to measurements of a tool with an insulating body. These computational results have been verified in laboratory measurements on actual tools based on this design.

[Para 89] An experimental prototype similar to the multi-electrode design (e.g., the tool shown in FIG. 7) was built and tested in a large tank filled with tap water (79.2 mS/m). This prototype has 8 short electrodes. The borehole was simulated by a conductive plastic pipe, such as TIVAR™ 1000 from Poly Hi Dolidur (Fort Wayne, IN), filled with salt water (6.16 S/m). The internal diameter of the plastic pipe is 13 inches.

[Para 90] FIG. 16 shows a finite-difference model of an experimental prototype tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. The prototype was designed with SLDMCYL, a 3D cylindrical finite-difference electromagnetic simulator developed at Schlumberger. The electrode between the receiver coils at 15 and 21 inches was omitted, and the prototype has two electrodes surrounding the transmitter, instead of four. The fingered electrodes, of the type shown in FIG. 8A, are modeled as anisotropic cylindrical shells (magenta) having zero conductivity in the azimuthal direction, and a high conductivity in the axial and radial directions. They are connected to the central conductor (orange) by anisotropic disks (cyan) having zero conductivity in the axial and azimuthal directions. This representation of the electrodes is similar to but not equivalent to the segmented electrode model in FIG. 8A.

[Para 91] Modeling indicates that the responses are unaffected by the resistance of the fingers and disks for a reasonable range of resistance. Good agreement between the measurements and calculations was obtained for the 27" receivers (FIG. 17) as well as the 39" (FIG. 18). These tests confirmed that the modeling codes correctly predict the reduction of the borehole effects.

[Para 92] FIG. 19 shows a finite-difference model of a similar prototype with nine short electrodes. The electrode between the receiver coils at 15 and 21 inches was included in this prototype. The prototype was tested in a conductive pipe (TIVAR™ pipe) having a diameter approximately 7.9 inches and filled with salt water with a conductivity of 5.68 S/m. The tank conductivity was 56.8 mS/m in this case. The measured and calculated responses for the 27-inch spacing are shown in FIG. 20. In the 7.9-inch diameter tube, the geometry cannot be controlled as accurately as in the 13-inch tube, so the agreement in FIG. 20 is not as close as in FIG. 17.

[Para 93] FIG. 21 shows responses from another variant with five one-inch electrodes and four three-inch fingered electrodes near the transmitter. Sufficiently close agreement between the calculated and experimental results is obtained for the 27" receivers (FIG. 22). This design gives 27XX and 27YY responses that are practically independent of eccentricity for this borehole diameter.

[Para 94] The above description clearly shows that induction tools can be designed to be more “resistant” to borehole effects. FIG. 23 summarizes a method for designing an induction tool in accordance with one embodiment of the invention. As shown, a method 230 may start with the design of a conventional induction tool (step 231). The convention induction tool may be a multi-array tool, such as the AIT™, which typically includes a common transmitter and a plurality of receivers and the corresponding bucking coils spaced apart from the transmitter. Some induction tools may include more than one transmitter and others may included electrodes for the measurements of shallow formation resistivity. Note that the tool may include arrays having longitudinal magnetic dipole coils, transverse magnetic dipole coils, tilted coils, or triaxial coils.

[Para 95] Based on the design of the induction tools, locations of null sensitivity (z_0) may be computed at the harmonic means of the spacing between transmitter and the bucking coil (z_B) and the spacing between the transmitter and the receiver (z_R) (step 232). Each location of null sensitivity is between a main receiver coil and the bucking coil connected to it in series.

[Para 96] Finally, one or more electrodes may be included on the induction tool at one or more locations proximate the locations of null sensitivity (step 233). In addition, an additional electrode (or multi-electrodes) may be included beyond the last receiver, preferably located a symmetrical location with respect to the last electrode (or multi-electrodes). Furthermore, as shown above, additional electrodes may be included around the transmitter (step 234), and below the lowest receiver (step 235), to further reduce borehole effects.

[Para 97] Note that preferred embodiments use multi-electrodes (such as the fingered electrodes); however, some embodiments may include single electrodes (such as a button electrode or a ring electrode having insulating gaps to disrupt azimuthal conductivity). Further note that the above description uses transverse arrays to illustrate the problems associated with borehole effects. It is clear that embodiments of the invention can effectively suppress/reduce the borehole effects in the transverse arrays. However, one

of ordinary skill in the art would appreciate that embodiments of the invention may also be used with longitudinal arrays, tilted antenna arrays, or triaxial arrays. Embodiments of the invention are applicable to a wireline tool, a logging-while-drilling (LWD) tool, or a measurement-while-drilling (MWD) tool.

[Para 98] Advantages of embodiments of the invention include one or more of the following. Embodiments of the invention provide methods for canceling the large borehole effects that contaminate transverse or triaxial induction measurements. This cancellation technique is compatible with the mechanical construction of a wireline induction sonde, and has a minimal impact on the conventional coaxial induction measurements.

[Para 99] Embodiments of the invention provides an approximate formula for the position of null sensitivity where a small electrode (or a ring of multiple electrodes or fingered electrodes) may be placed between a main receiver coil and the bucking coil connected to it in series.

[Para 100] Properties of a tool in accordance with embodiments of the invention are similar to those of a metal-body tool with respect to (1) homogeneous medium response, (2) anisotropy response, (3) borehole eccentricity effects, and (4) separability of vertical response and borehole effects.

[Para 101] While the invention has been described with respect to a limited number of embodiments, those skilled in the art, having benefit of this disclosure, will appreciate that other embodiments can be devised which do not depart from the scope of the invention as disclosed herein. Accordingly, the scope of the invention should be limited only by the attached claims.

